

## Burson • Marsteller

1850 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5890  
202.833.4483  
FAX: 202.775.3794

Thomas Humber  
Senior Vice President

*File Repace to Tom Borelli*

RECEIVED

MAR 9 1992

STEVEN C. PARRISH  
PM MANAGEMENT CORP.

*Left me  
know  
the plan  
Humb*

March 6, 1992

TO: Steve Parrish  
FROM: Tom Humber  
RE: Prevention '92 Meeting/Repace  
COPY: Tom Borelli, Lisa Velenovsky

### Situation:

Repace to speak on "Passive Smoking: Health Effects, Policy Development and Community Activism." Program lists him as Ph.D. with EPA, but we do not know if appearance has official sanction.

He could use meeting to discuss Revised Risk Assessment.

We would expect little press coverage unless set up with Paul Raeburn.

### Options

1. Pre-emptively challenge Repace's appearance to the EPA. If we've read signals right, he is something of an embarrassment, and there would be a fair chance of having him cancelled by EPA, having his remarks softened or having him speak as a private citizen.

Successful or not, this option virtually guarantees a Raeburn story.

2. Let him go on, tape his presentation, hope he goes way overboard, plant some questions in the audience to help that along, tar him as EPA's prime operative on ETS and use that, first politically and then publicly, to denounce the bias of the EPA.

This option has great appeal, few downsides and some interesting opportunities in the dynamics. If the EPA embraces him, we gain some credibility for bias. If the EPA tries to build distance from him, we then exploit his relationship to the SPI project, questioning EPA honesty and calling further attention to the little tip-of-the iceberg scandal.

This option is recommended.

3. News release/statement/backgrounder to be released at conference to deal with substance of Risk Assessment.

RECEIVED

MAR 18 1992

TOM BORELLI

2023583864

- 2 -

Not. Don't create a story on his turf where it might not otherwise materialize.

4. News release/statement/backgrounder on substance of Risk Assessment for response if there is any coverage.

This is necessary as a contingency, although little work is required since existing materials provide those talking points. Over the last few weeks, I have begun to think about the workplace studies excluded from consideration by EPA. Since that has some potency (albeit relative) and speaks directly to the OSHA phase of the battle, I'd like to develop the argument, and a meeting like this could provide some opportunity to test it, if there is to be any coverage.

One last note. We and Lisa Barrera are checking new EPA ethics code to determine if possible ethics violations may enter into the picture. If so, this could add fuel to option #2.

2023583865